UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,489	12/22/2003	M. Charlotte Baltus	117428	2063

27074 7590 05/03/2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/03/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/740,489	BALTUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-12 and 14-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,10-12 and 14-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on: 1/30/2007.

2. Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended. Claims 2, 8, 9, and 13 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, and 14-16 are pending.

3. Acknowledgement has been made to the amendments for claims 7, 12, and 16, thus, the 35 USC 101 rejections have been withdrawn.

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 14, and 16 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002), claims 4, 11, and 15 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002), claim 5 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Warmus et al (US Patent Number: 6,952,801 B2, issued: Oct. 4, 2005, filed: May 10, 2001), claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Jeffery et al. (US Patent Number: 6,957,384 B2, Issued: Oct. 18, 2005, filed: Dec. 27, 2000).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:3

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 3, 6, 10, 12, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002).

With regards to claim 1, Ball et al teaches a method for highlighting changes in an information object comprising:

- *Identifying a user*: Referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified. For resource optimization, the user is identified as well, as explained in paragraph 0168.
- *Receiving an initial request from the user for a selected version of an information object*: (paragraph 0059: whereas, the external service receives the web page selection request from a user for a current version of a web page 'A'. Additionally, it is taught that the user can enter a snapshot program, specifying an information object, for one or more selected versions of an information object Fig 3A.) Furthermore, the an initial request is also described in paragraph 0077, whereas the user calls for the selected version of an information object/page)
- *In response to the initial request for the information object, and without user intervention subsequent to the initial request, obtaining a most recent version of*

the information object as the selected version of the information object requested by the user (paragraph 0059: whereas, the external service retrieves the most recent version of the information object requested by the user that is available from the storage of the external service (also described in paragraphs 0055, 0106), and shown in Fig 3A.). Additionally, the same step for retrieving an information object is performed without user intervention as explained in paragraph 0077, the most recent version is obtained/retrieved.

- *Obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user* (Previous version(s) of the page(s) requested by the identified user are stored together with subsequent changes as indicated in Fig 3, reference number 6 (paragraph 0055). Additionally, one or more previous versions of the information object is/are obtained as shown in Fig 3A, based upon the snapshot request for an information object. The previous versions obtained for display in Fig 3A, include *the previous version of the information object being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user*, as explained in paragraphs 0055-0059). Furthermore, the previous version based on the result of identifying the user is obtained (without user intervention), as explained in paragraph 0077, and Fig 6.)
- *Automatically determining a difference between the selected version of the information object and the previous version of the information object:* (in response to the request for the information object, the snapshot facility provides a means for automatically determining the difference between the selected

version of the information object, and the previous version of the information object (paragraph 0195, Fig 3A: whereas, in response to the request for the information object, the snapshot facility displays a screen, which allows the user to automatically determine the difference between the selected version of the information object, and previous version of the information object using the automatic differencing program 'htmldiff'. Additionally, the difference is determined automatically without user intervention as explained in paragraph 0077, and Fig. 6).

- *Automatically outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference*: The output from the 'htmldiff' program is automatically outputted to a display as a rendered version of the information object, highlighting the difference, as explained in paragraph 0059 (whereas, the output of the rendered version is shown in the figure 4 screen shot) such that the image "represents changes, and contains material not present in the previous version of the page, but which has been added (paragraph 0061)". To highlight the changes, a "particular font, particular size, particular color, and particular background (paragraph 0061)" may be used)). Additionally, as explained in paragraph 0077, the highlighted difference is automatically outputted without user intervention, and displayed.

With regards to claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches a method further comprises, *displaying the rendered version of the information*: The rendered version of the information is rendered for display in a browser application (Figure 4:

whereas, changes are highlighted/marked in the document (in this case, highlights include italics, cross-outs, asterisks, and more) that were selected for access by the user and displayed in a browser application as shown in the screen shot)

With regards to claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al teaches *wherein the most recent version of the information object*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Furthermore, Ball et al also teaches *the most recent version of the information object that the user is authorized to access* (paragraph 0170: whereas, a system is used to authorize users, before information is sent to each user. Furthermore, as discussed in paragraph 0086, each hotlist (list of information items) are managed/authorized for each particular user).

With respect to claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Ball et al teaches:

At least one database that stores the current version and the previous version (Ball et al, paragraph 0130: whereas, an application called NO HANDS, is used by the external service to help provide users with a way to organize, retrieve, and view differences between pages. Since NO HANDS provides for a collection of information organized in such a way to aid users or a computer program to more efficiently select pieces of data; NO HANDS implements a database). Furthermore, NO HANDS is used to help present the differences between the current and previous versions that are stored in the external service. (paragraph 0131: through one of NO HANDS' tools called Htmldiff).

An output device that outputs the rendered version: Ball et al inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered

version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 12, for a system performing a similar method as the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to the display device*: Ball et al. inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002).

With regards to claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected

document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is shown through the use of an web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

With regards to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Therefore, Ball et al. inherently teaches *a display is used as an output device* in order for the user to view the screen shot of figure 4. Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images

displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

With regards to claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to a printing device*: Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web

pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Warmus et al (US Patent Number: 6,952,801 B2, issued: Oct. 4, 2005, filed: May 10, 2001).

With respect to claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. does not teach *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object.*

Warmus et al. however, teaches *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object* (Warmus et al., column 3, lines 60-62: whereas, "the step of specifying page description language instructions to produce a barcode on the page. The barcode may be indicative of tracking information").

Furthermore, Ball et al and Warmus et al. are from the same problem solving area: Document processing.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's storage of page content to further include metadata for the creation of a barcode to identify the information object's version as

taught by Warmus et al. The combination of Ball et al, and Warmus et al. would have allowed Ball et al's version tracking system to be used outside of electronic form so users would have been able to identify and differentiate between different versions of hardcopies.

8. Claims 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in further view of Jeffery et al. (US Patent Number: 6,957,384 B2, Issued: Oct. 18, 2005, filed: Dec. 27, 2000).

With regards to claim 7, Ball et al. teaches an apparatus that highlights changes in an information object comprising:

- *A processor that, in response to the initial request and without user intervention subsequent to the initial request, retrieves a most recent version of the information object as the selected information object, and a previous version of the information object, the previous version being obtained based on the identification of the user and being a version of the information object most recently accessed by the user*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *A delta determination device that, in response to the initial request and without user intervention subsequent to the initial request, automatically determines a difference between the selected version and the previous version*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

- *A renderer that, in response to the initial request and without user intervention subsequent to the initial request, automatically generates a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

In addition, Ball et al's external service teaches *identifying a user* as by referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified. Furthermore, Ball et al teaches *a request for retrieving a selected information object*, as similarly explained in the rejection for the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Yet, Ball et al does not expressly teach *a query interface that receives a user identification and request for a selected information object.*

Jeffery et al however, teaches *a query interface that receives user identification* (Figure 24: whereas, an interface is shown and a form is used to query the user for a login ID) *and initial request data for a selected information object* (Figure 7-1, column 10, lines 2-5: whereas, an interface is shown such that a user is able to click on (select) a specific contract number to request data for that particular contract/information object and "contracts may be displayed and accessed").

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's user identification routine to further include the query interface for user identification and information object data request as taught by Jeffery et al. The combination of Ball et al and Jeffery et al, would have helped Ball et al's invention to "provide a method for storing, organizing and providing remote electronic access to documents" (Jeffery et al, column 2, lines 24-26).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 10-12, and 14-16 have been considered but are not persuasive (applicant is respectfully directly to the explanations in the above claim rejections).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 4/27/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
April 27, 2007

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER